

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

WILLIAM GRAY.

Case No. 2:20-cv-01839-KJD-EJY

Plaintiff,

## ORDER

1

## LAS VEGAS CITY JAIL,

Defendant.

10  
11 On October 7, 2020, this Court issued an order directing Plaintiff to file both a  
12 complaint and a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full  
13 filing fee of \$400 on or before December 7, 2020. (ECF No. 3 at 2-3). The December 7,  
14 2020 deadline has now expired and Plaintiff has not filed a complaint, an application to  
15 proceed *in forma pauperis*, paid the full \$400 filing fee, or otherwise responded to the  
16 Court's order.

17 District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the  
18 exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . .  
19 dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831  
20 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party’s failure  
21 to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.  
22 See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (affirming dismissal for  
23 noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir.  
24 1992) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of  
25 complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal  
26 for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of  
27 address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (affirming  
28 dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421,

1 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (affirming dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with  
2 local rules).

3 In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey  
4 a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors:  
5 (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to  
6 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring  
7 disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.  
8 See *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at  
9 130; *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

10 Here, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously  
11 resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket, weigh in favor of  
12 dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs in favor of  
13 dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay  
14 in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See *Anderson v. Air*  
15 *West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor—public policy favoring  
16 disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of  
17 dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey  
18 the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives"  
19 requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779  
20 F.2d at 1424.

21 The Court's order requiring Plaintiff to file a complaint and an application to  
22 proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full filing fee on or before December 7, 2020  
23 expressly stated: "IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, if Plaintiff does not file a complaint  
24 and a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* with all three documents or  
25 pay the full \$400 filing fee for a civil action on or before December 7, 2020, the Court will  
26 dismiss this action without prejudice for Plaintiff to refile the case with the Court, under a  
27 new case number, when Plaintiff is able to file a complaint and has all three documents  
28 needed to file a complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pays the full \$400

1 filing fee." (ECF No. 3 at 3). Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning that dismissal would  
2 result from noncompliance with the Court's order to file a complaint and an application to  
3 proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full filing fee on or before December 7, 2020.

4 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this action is dismissed without prejudice  
5 based on Plaintiff's failure to file a complaint and an application to proceed *in forma*  
6 *pauperis* or pay the full filing fee in compliance with this Court's order dated October 7,  
7 2020.

8 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall enter judgment  
9 accordingly and close this case. No additional documents will be filed in this closed case.

10 DATED: December 19, 2020



11  
12 

---

KENT J. DAWSON  
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28